

1954

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

14281

application of the situation to the entire State of Mississippi, although the northern part of the State is affected more severely than is the southern area.

So I join in urging that this subject be given prompt and adequate attention by the Department of Agriculture, and be promptly attended to, and that the Department now send its men to the stricken areas and have them obtain first-hand reports and information, and that the proper action be taken promptly. I submit that matter to the Department of Agriculture, not with a plea for relief merely as a money benefit, but in order to have this emergency met and to avoid a calamity. A positive program should be planned that will meet the realities of this distress. This should include feed and other forms of practical assistance.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I have been greatly interested in what has been said by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], and the distinguished junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. The situation in a very large area of the country is serious; it is critical, and is daily worsening.

Mr. President, the saddest thing about the entire picture is the utter indifference with which the Department of Agriculture regards it.

I wish to say to my distinguished friends, the Senators from Georgia, that in this situation the troubles of their State would not be over, even if they could have prevailed upon the Department of Agriculture to declare their State a part of the disaster area. Some weeks ago, evidence with reference to the drought situation in Oklahoma was submitted to the Department of Agriculture. Prior to that time, portions of Texas and of Colorado and of Wyoming had been designated as disaster areas, and available for assistance under the program which the Secretary of Agriculture was authorized to put into effect for such areas. Information was given to the Department of Agriculture with reference to Kansas, Missouri, Arkansas, and Oklahoma. The Assistant Secretary of Agriculture went to Missouri, personally visited a very large part of the State, and recommended assistance for 70-odd counties, which were designated as disaster areas.

I thought it was quite coincidental or quite significant that he managed to get that done in the district of Representative DEWEY SHORT, just a day or two before Representative SHORT's primary election, in which he was in a very hot contest. But regardless of how it happened, Mr. President, I thought the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture was late, not early, in getting it done.

At the same time, some 26 of Oklahoma's 77 counties were so designated—apparently on a hit-and-miss basis, either in complete ignorance of the fact or in total disregard of the fact that most of the other counties in Oklahoma were equally distressed from the standpoint of the drought and its devastation

and destruction. Since that time, 11 other counties in Oklahoma have been so designated, making, as of now, a total of 37 counties in Oklahoma to be so designated.

But the farmers in those 37 counties are scarcely more distressed than the farmers in counties which are equally entitled to such a designation, although it has not been made as to them. If the Secretary of Agriculture and his staff had their heads buried in the sand, they could not be in a worse situation of complete indifference and disregard of the realities of the present situation, than their present actions indicate them to be.

Mr. President, someone should put a charge of dynamite under someone in the Department of Agriculture, in order to get the Department to visualize and realize the situation and to meet its responsibilities with reference to it. Today, literally thousands of farm families in the drought-stricken areas of the States which have been mentioned and in States adjacent thereto or nearby have been—as the result of drought and the accompanying disaster—reduced to a position where they can no longer stay on and maintain and operate their farms. Wells which have not gone dry in a quarter of a century, are going dry today. Thousands of farm ponds, which in years past have proven adequate, today are dry. Pastures are burned. Crops have been burned. Yet, Mr. President, the Secretary either refuses to designate these areas as disaster areas, or, having so designated them, refuses to do anything effective to benefit the people of those areas.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield to my colleague for a question.

Mr. MONRONEY. I join my senior colleague in calling the attention of the Senate to the disaster which faces our farmers and the need for urgent and speedy action in this drought disaster, particularly in counties which have already been declared to be critical disaster areas.

This is the third straight year, as the distinguished senior Senator from Oklahoma knows, that these same farmers, cattlemen, and people on small farms have had to suffer from unprecedented drought. This comes on the heels of two preceding droughts, with temperatures ranging from 105 to 120, which are devastating to feed crops and all forms of crop life in the counties which have already been declared to be disaster areas, as well as in neighboring counties, which have not yet been so declared.

We find it difficult to make people understand the urgency of the needs. If help is not extended quickly, we shall see liquidated the farms of the finest farm families in the State of Oklahoma—because of delay. This program must be thrown into gear fast.

It seems to me that the Department of Agriculture should turn this program over to the very best agricultural leaders in the State of Oklahoma. A piece of paper declaring an Oklahoma county

a disaster area or a critical disaster area is very poor relief for the hungry livestock and for the devastation we find on Oklahoma farms. It seems to me that we should treat this situation as we would treat a flood emergency or any other emergency. Time is of the essence in meeting the needs.

I associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished senior Senator from Oklahoma. It is time for someone to get busy and coordinate and expedite this program, so that relief for our people can be forthcoming.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I thank my colleague for those friendly remarks, which are so pointed and accurate.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does it not seem almost immoral to hear that this country is facing such a tremendous surplus, about which we have been talking—and we are struggling to find a way to do something about the surpluses which, we seek to prevent in the future—and now that our warehouses are bulging with surplus grains of nearly all kinds, grains which these people need for feed, still the Department seems to be unable to find a way to make those grains available to farmers who are facing complete disaster, bankruptcy, and the loss of their farms? Surely the Department of Agriculture has enough imagination and energy to do something about this situation. I cannot understand why some plan has not been devised, or some request made for authority. If the Department has no authority, why has not a request been made of the Congress for authority? I understand the Department has the authority.

I wonder if the distinguished Senator can think of anything we can do to put dynamite under the Department and to make it move.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I appreciate the question of the distinguished Senator from Arkansas. I would put the dynamite under the Secretary of Agriculture, and I would light the fuse, if I thought it would get him off that part of his anatomy which he is wearing out and get him out where the duty and the responsibility exist in this regard.

We cannot find 1 farmer in 500 who will admit or is capable of being convinced that he has a Secretary of Agriculture. It is a tragedy beyond description, Mr. President.

We have an abundance and a surplus of grains, and the Secretary has put a grain program into effect, whereby he directed that farmers in the disaster area be permitted to buy feed made from surplus grain at a price of 60 cents a hundred pounds under the market value. The market value of most of those grains has gone up, since the Secretary issued the order, a greater amount than 60 cents a hundred.

The Secretary has put into effect a hay program, and I wish to tell the Senate what that is. If the State makes

a certain contract to supervise, participate, designate, and cooperate, the Department of Agriculture will pay half the freight on hay at a cost not to exceed \$10 a ton. I ask Senators what benefit that is to a farmer who cannot pay for the hay, let alone half the freight? It is like placing a sumptuous, alluring feast in front of starving men and building a partition of bulletproof glass between them and the food, placing men with shotguns on guard to shoot them down in case they succeed in breaking through the glass. That would do them as much good as what the Secretary of Agriculture is doing under the guise of putting into effect a drought disaster relief program for certain designated counties.

The Secretary holds out the promise, but the only farmer in the country today who is more disappointed, more disillusioned, and angrier than those who are in an area which has not been designated a disaster area is the farmer who is in an area which has been so designated, and who finds that he is getting nothing by reason of such designation.

Certainly the Secretary of Agriculture has the authority to make loans. But the Federal Reserve bank would loan money on less collateral and at a lower rate of interest than would the Secretary of Agriculture. He is not loaning money; he is hoarding it. Oh, he is making a record. Farm families who are entitled to relief, and who without it, will become casualties, are being denied the opportunity for economic survival. We have been giving away billions of dollars. Mr. President, somehow, in some way, justice must be done.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the distinguished Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. After listening to the Senator from Oklahoma, I judge that his people in Oklahoma feel toward the Secretary of Agriculture much the same as the people of Wisconsin feel toward the Secretary. The Secretary of Agriculture came up there to speak. Did the Senator read the article in the New York Times, commenting on that speech of the Secretary?

Mr. KERR. Yes; I did.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Did the Senator read that a snow fence was built 25 feet out from the platform to keep the people from tearing the Secretary limb from limb? They were not satisfied with that. Did the Senator read that they built a barbed-wire entanglement a little closer, about 10 feet out, and left 15 feet between? Even with the barbed-wire entanglement that arrangement was not satisfactory. Guards were stationed between the snow fence and the barbed-wire entanglement to guard the Secretary of Agriculture. Did the Senator read that story?

Mr. KERR. I read that story, Mr. President, but I arrived at a little different interpretation of the story from that given by the distinguished Senator from South Carolina.

As I remember the story, the snow fence and the barbed-wire entangle-

ments were placed in position at the request of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Is it not true that the people had threatened to tear the Secretary limb from limb?

Mr. KERR. The Secretary's conscience must have been so guilty or his realization of his inadequacy so intense that he promoted the building of that barricade to defend him. Then he asked for an escort of 12 special deputies to protect him.

The facts show that within 2 weeks of that time the farmers in that particular area held a special election and elected a Democratic Representative for the first time, as I understand, in many years. If the President ever gets around to giving the Secretary of Agriculture his just reward and just due, he will decorate him for his efficiency in getting that Democratic Representative elected.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. I, too, read the article to which Senators have referred. It is amazing how many different interpretations one can get from an article. I understood that the protective devices, such as the barbed wire, were placed in position for the purpose of protecting the farmers from the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. KERR. I must say that that is the most logical interpretation of the situation I have yet heard. It may be that the distinguished Senator from Georgia has put his finger on the correct analysis of the situation.

The Secretary of Agriculture has authority to make loans. He has authority to provide feed for the cattle in disaster areas, from surplus crops at any price he wishes to charge.

What he has done is to fix the price at a level which makes it certain that the farmers cannot get the feed. In the meantime, devastation, destruction, and economic bankruptcy march on, totally disregarded by the Secretary of Agriculture, when, by the exercise of the discretion and authority given him, he could alleviate the suffering and prevent much of the destruction which is taking place.

I am glad that Senators have today called upon him for action. While hope springs eternal in the human breast, I must say that if there is anything to be gained from experience and the knowledge of what he has not done, it is quite likely that the hope that he will act is not altogether justified. Nevertheless, I indulge the hope that he will act in a manner which will meet their requirements and the responsibilities of his office.

COPYRIGHTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6616) to amend title 17, United States Code, entitled "Copyrights."

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. REYNOLDS in the chair). The Senator will state it.

Mr. PAYNE. What is the unfinished business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The unfinished business is Calendar No. 2235, House bill 6616, to amend the copyright law.

The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, is the question on the passage of the copyright bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The question is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator wish to speak on the bill?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I do, indeed. I sincerely regret that I must be a "pinch-hitter" tonight, but the members of the subcommittee who supported this bill are all absent.

Mr. President, on June 25 last, the Senate gave its advice and consent to ratification of the Universal Copyright Convention signed at Geneva in September 1952. This chamber manifested its approval of that treaty by the overwhelming vote of 65 to 3.

In order to give effect to the provisions of the treaty, a number of minor changes are required in our domestic copyright law. The present bill, S. 2559, is the implementing legislation which will make the necessary changes.

The substance of the bill has, in fact, already received the attention of this body, because when we took up the Copyright Convention the Senate had to consider the specific changes in our law which would have to be made under the convention. All of these matters were brought to the attention of the Senate, both in the committee report, and in debate on the floor. The convention itself contains obligations which could only be performed by the United States if the changes provided for in this bill were made.

Mr. President, seldom has any legislation been introduced on the floor of Congress which has had such widespread support from so many segments of the American public as has this bill. The volume of favorable correspondence received by the committee from authors, playwrights, composers, publishing com-

1954

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

14283

panies, library associations, Catholic, Protestants, and Christian Science publication societies, music companies, photographers associations, radio, and television organizations, and motion picture companies, was overwhelming.

That correspondence is an impressive measure of the public conviction that this legislation is necessary and desirable.

Mr. President, I should like to introduce into the record a list I have of the groups which have indicated their support for S. 2559.

I send this list to the desk and ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the Record at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair calls the Senator's attention to the fact that the Senate is considering the House bill instead of the Senate bill.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I am referring to the Senate bill, but I understand the House bill is the bill before the Senate.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

GROUPS SUPPORTING THE UNIVERSAL COPYRIGHT CONVENTION AND THE RELATED LEGISLATION

American Academy of Arts and Sciences; American Bar Association; American Book Publishers Council, Inc.; American Civil Liberties Union; American Council on Education; American Council of Learned Societies; American Library Association; American Society of Composers, Authors, and Publishers; Artists Equity Association; Association of American University Presses; Authors League of America; Book Manufacturers' Institute; Catholic Library Association; Chicago Bar Association; Chicago Patent Law Association; Christian Science Church; Congress of Industrial Organizations; Copyright Committee of the Bar Association of the City of New York; Curtis Publications; Federal Bar Association; Hearst Publications; Inter-American Bar Association; Los Angeles County Bar Association; McGraw-Hill Publishing Co.; Motion Picture Association of America; Music Publishers Association; Music Publishers Protective Association; Mystery Writers Association of America; National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters; National Music Council; Patent Bar Association; Photographers' Association of America; Protestant Church-Owned Publishers Association; Readers' Digest; Song Writers Protective Association.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. As I previously stated, I am pinchhitting. My remarks were prepared to be directed to the Senate bill, but I am aware of the fact that the House bill is pending.

The bill has the endorsement of virtually the entire organized copyright bar, including both the section of patent trade mark and copyright law, and the section of international and comparative law of the American Bar Association. Upon joint motion of these two sections, the house of delegates of the American Bar Association on March 8, 1954, adopted a resolution endorsing the provisions of the bills before us.

These bills would make the following changes in our copyright law:

Section 1 of the bill amends section 9 of title 17 of the United States Code, by adding a new subsection (c). The subsection provides that whenever the universal copyright convention shall have come into force between the United

States and a foreign state or nation, copyright protection under title 17 of the code shall extend to the work of an author or copyright proprietor who is a citizen or subject of such foreign state or nation and to the works first published therein. A number of formal requirements are then listed from which such protected works would be exempt. The principal exemptions involved are these:

First. The elimination of the manufacturing requirements as to English language books and periodicals originating in a member state;

Second. The qualification of the right of the Register of Copyrights, seldom if ever exercised, to void copyright in a foreign work for failure to make the required deposit after demand;

Third. The statutory requirements of copyright notice are relaxed;

Fourth. The requirements for a separate proclamation under section 1 (e) is removed.

Section 2 of the bill modifies section 16 of title 17 of the United States Code so as to permit an American author who first publishes a book abroad in the English language to import 1,500 copies of the book. This privilege, which is already enjoyed by foreign writers, has not until now been available to American authors. The bill would remove this discrimination so as to permit Americans, as well as foreigners, to test the market to determine the desirability of printing a run in the United States.

Section 3 of the bill modifies the provisions with respect to the notice required by section 19 of title 17 of the code, so that an American author or publisher may utilize the symbol C in a circle © as an alternative statutory copyright notice in a book. This change is desirable to permit a single, simple notice to be used by domestic publishers for all books marketed, whether here or abroad.

The changes under sections 2 and 3 of the bill, while not required to implement the convention, are regarded as meritorious by the copyright profession. There has been no objection to them from any source.

It remains to be mentioned that the House of Representatives, on August 3 last, by a more than two-thirds approval, passed the companion bill, H. R. 6616, which is identical with S. 2559.

Mr. President, it is my firm conviction that the proposed legislation is sound as a matter of copyright law and earnestly desired by the professional groups in the United States which are most directly affected. It is, moreover, a measure which is indispensable if we are to give effect to the convention which the Senate has already overwhelmingly approved.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record a statement in further explanation of the copyright bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR FULBRIGHT ON S. 2559

The pending bill, as has been observed previously, would effect a slight change in what we call the manufacturing clause. I think it should be pointed out that this clause does not prohibit imports of books. What it does is to deny the precious right of copyright protection to a foreign author writing in English, unless he also manufactures, prints, and binds his book here.

This may come as a surprise to some of us, but we in the United States who are accustomed to viewing ourselves as righteous in so many things, have never been solicitous about protecting the rights of foreign authors. In fact, for the greater portion of our history, from 1790 to 1891, it wasn't even possible for foreign writers to secure copyright here. This period was our age of literary piracy. There was nothing in our law to prevent thievery of the great works of that time. Dickens, Thackeray, Stevenson, and others were freely pirated, until public opinion demanded the end of this national sin.

At long last, in 1891, a revision of the Copyright Act extended protection to foreign writers on condition that they comply with all our formalities—including the requirement that their works be manufactured in the United States. The manufacturing clause extended to all foreign writers, no matter what the language of their works. Finally this requirement was removed with respect to foreigners abroad writing in a language other than English. Such is its present form.

There may have been a selfish reason early in our history to adopt such an attitude. We were a young Nation, an importing Nation, without an established printing industry. It might have made some sense to say "We will not grant copyright to foreign authors unless they manufacture here." And so we were free to pirate such works, which we did. Dickens and the others saw their works sold without a dime in revenue coming back to them.

But today, the situation is completely different. We are no longer an importing country in the literary and artistic field. We are an exporting country. And it's no small business. Book exports alone account for almost \$25 million annually. Receipts from foreign showings of motion pictures account for another \$175 million. It is now American authors, American music, American motion pictures, which are desired overseas. It is now we who need protection against piracy and uncompensated use.

But we cannot get the magnificent kind of protection provided for under the Copyright Convention which the Senate approved last June, unless we make some concessions. And virtually all that is asked of us of any significance is the slight modification of that clause on our statutes which requires a foreign subject, residing abroad, who writes in the English language, to have his book printed here in order to get copyright protection. Everyone else who writes in English must manufacture here—including Americans and resident aliens.

The pending bill is so reasonable, so eminently fair, that it is a small price indeed to pay for the benefits which our people will enjoy from a convention which, for the first time, assures them of adequate and sound protection throughout the entire world.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. House bill 6616 having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill was passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 2559 is indefinitely postponed.

COMPACT FOR ALLOCATION OF WATERS OF THE MISSOURI RIVER

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar 2352, Senate bill 2821, the interstate compact for allocation of waters of the Missouri River.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 2821) granting the consent of Congress to the States of Colorado, Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wyoming, to enter into a compact for the allocation of waters of the Missouri River.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from California.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the consent of Congress is hereby given to the States of Colorado, Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wyoming to negotiate and enter into a compact for a basinwide, comprehensive program of unified planning for the attainment of the conservation and development of the water resources projects of the Missouri Basin, and for the coordination of the water resources development of the agencies of the States in cooperation with the agencies of the United States: *Provided*, That existing compacts between the States and decrees of the United States Supreme Court relating to any of the waters of the Missouri River or its tributaries shall be fully recognized: *Provided further*, That any compact negotiated pursuant to this act shall recognize the provisions of existing law that the use for navigation of waters arising in States lying wholly or partly west of the 98th meridian, shall be only such use as does not conflict with any beneficial use of such waters for domestic, municipal, stock water, irrigation, mining, or industrial purposes: *And provided further*, That nothing in this act shall apply to any area of the National Park System established as of the date of this act or any future areas added by acts of Congress.

Sec. 2. The President is authorized to appoint a commissioner to represent the United States to participate in such negotiations, and who shall make report to the President and to the Congress on the proceedings and any compact entered into.

Sec. 3. Any such compact shall not be binding or obligatory upon any of the parties thereto unless and until the same shall have been ratified by the legislatures of each of the signatory States and consented to by the Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is to permit the States of Colorado, Wyoming, Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Missouri, Iowa and Minnesota to enter into a compact to establish a basin-wide unified plan for the development of the Missouri River.

The bill provides that there shall be no conflict with or modification whatsoever of the compacts presently existing in the Basin among the States, or any part of them; and it further pro-

vides that the agencies of the States and of the Federal Government shall cooperate and work together for the orderly development of the water resources of the basin. The sole purpose of the bill is to authorize the States to arrive at an agreement to achieve that objective.

A representative of the United States Government will sit in the proceedings. After the States have agreed, and the compact has been approved by the legislatures of the various States, the subject will then be returned to Congress, and it will be for Congress to determine whether the agreement which has been proposed and entered into by the various States shall be approved by Congress and become the law of the river.

Compacts of this nature have been entered into many times. All precautions have been taken to insure that none of the rights of the several States will be violated.

The governors of all 10 States of the Basin have approved the bill. The committee considered the bill, which was first approved by the Secretary of the Interior and then by the Bureau of the Budget, and reported it unanimously. I know of no reason why the bill should not be passed, because I have heard no objection to it whatsoever.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment which I ask to have read.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 3, line 2, in the committee amendment, it is proposed to insert after the word "law", a comma and the word "and."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota to the committee amendment.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, the amendment to the committee amendment is to correct what I think must have been an error in copying, because the comma and the word "and" appear in the proviso as the bill is printed in the report. The purpose of my amendment is to make the text of the committee amendment as printed in the bill conform with the amendment as set forth in the report on the bill.

Mr. BARRETT. The Senator from South Dakota is entirely correct, and the committee accepts the Senator's amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I merely desire to repeat what I said during the time when the bill was under discussion on the call of the calendar. The bill represents the wishes of the governors of the several States, as set forth in various resolutions which have been adopted from time to time, particularly in their recent meeting at Yellowstone Park.

The Governor of South Dakota, Hon. Sigurd Anderson, has been chairman of the committee of governors during the past year, and in several ways and on various occasions he has expressed to me his deep personal conviction that the

States of the Missouri River Basin should have the opportunity to negotiate a compact through their representatives, with a representative of the Federal Government being present, and then to submit the compact to Congress for ratification. That is precisely what the bill proposes to do.

As the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT] has so correctly stated, the bill conforms with the custom and practice of the States in that area and with the proviso contained in the Flood Control Act of 1944, with respect to the beneficial consumptive use of waters which lie wholly or partly west of the 98th meridian.

In all respects the bill recognizes the desires and aims of the people concerned, and recognizes the authority of Congress over subjects relating to interstate commerce, in that the proposed compact will be submitted to Congress for ratification.

I, therefore, join with the Senator from Wyoming and other Senators in urging the enactment of the bill.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I join with my colleague in support of the bill. I read into the Record during the call of the calendar this afternoon a letter from the Governor of Minnesota. I know that for several years there has been a great deal of interest in the bill in Minnesota, Minnesota is joining with the other States and their administrators in the study of the compact. Therefore, I urge that favorable consideration be given to the bill.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to join the Senator from Wyoming, the Senator from South Dakota, and the Senator from Minnesota in giving my enthusiastic support to the bill. It seems to me what we need to keep in mind is that the bill fits in with the spirit and intent of the compact section of the Constitution of the United States. When the Constitution was adopted it was intended that in matters of interest to groups of States they should be authorized to enter into compacts that involved a consideration of common problems. That is what the bill seeks to effectuate.

Furthermore, I think the Senator from Wyoming went to the very heart of the question when he pointed out that all Congress would be doing when it passed the bill, if it should be passed—and I hope it will be—would be to authorize the respective States to negotiate a compact. The passage of the bill would not result in the adoption of a compact which the States have negotiated. In a sense, it is an authorization bill. It would really authorize the States, under the compact section of the Constitution, to proceed to negotiate a compact.

Surely, no Senator would wish to deny that under the compact section of the Constitution of the United States the subject matter of compacts is one which does not fall, without action by Congress, within the purview and the jurisdiction of the States. All the checks the constitutional fathers intended will be available to us after the passage of the bill, as has been pointed out by the Senator from Wyoming and the Senator from South Dakota. The compact will